

SYMMETRY RESULTS FOR CLASSICAL SOLUTIONS OF MONGE-AMPERE SYSTEMS ON A BOUNDED PLANAR DOMAIN

LI MA, BAIYU LIU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, by the method of moving planes, we establish the monotonicity and symmetry properties of convex solutions for Monge-Ampere systems on bounded smooth planar domains.

Keyword: Method of Moving plane, Monge-Ampere system

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J60, 53C21, 58J05

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivated by two famous uniqueness theorems (namely, the Cohn-Vossen theorem and the Minkowski theorem for convex surfaces in 3-space) and the interesting work of C. Li [7] on symmetric results for Monge-Ampere equation, we investigate the monotonicity and symmetry results of convex solutions of the Monge-Ampere system in a bounded smooth planar domain. Similar problem in the whole plane is considered in [9]. In the case of a single equation, questions of symmetry kind have been intensively studied in the literature, see for example B. Gidas, W. M. Ni and L. Nirenberg [6] [5], W. X. Chen and C. Li [3] [4], C. Li [7], Y. Li and W.M. Ni [8], H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg [1]. Interesting Dirichlet problem for single Monge-Ampere equation has been discussed by N.S. Trudinger and J. Urbas in [10].

The system we consider is the following:

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \det(D^2u) + g(u, v, \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \det(D^2v) + f(u, v, \nabla v) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (D^2u) > 0, (D^2v) > 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded smooth domain and is convex in the x_1 direction. Roughly speaking, we prove that if the equations and the boundary conditions are monotone (symmetric) in a direction then the solutions are also monotone (symmetric) in that direction.

Without loss of generality, we assume $0 \in \Omega$ and

$$\text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega \text{ (} x_1 < 0 \text{), then } (x'_1, x_2) \in \Omega \text{ for } x'_1 \in (x_1, -x_1).$$

Here is our main result.

Theorem 1. *Let (u, v) be a classical solution of (1) with boundary value condition:*

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \partial\Omega, (x'_1, x_2) \in \Omega \text{ and } x_1 < x'_1, \\ &\text{then } u(x_1, x_2) > u(x'_1, x_2), \quad v(x_1, x_2) > v(x'_1, x_2); \\ &\text{if } (x_1, x_2), (x'_1, x_2) \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } x_1 < x'_1, \\ &\text{then } u(x_1, x_2) \geq u(x'_1, x_2), \quad v(x_1, x_2) \geq v(x'_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose f and g satisfy: $f, g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$;

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} g(u, v, p_1, p_2) &\geq g(u, v, -p_1, p_2), & \forall u, v, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall p_1 < 0, \\ f(u, v, p_1, p_2) &\geq f(u, v, -p_1, p_2), & \forall u, v, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall p_1 < 0; \end{aligned}$$

$$(4) \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, v, p_1, p_2) > 0, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(u, v, p_1, p_2) > 0 \quad \forall u, v, p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then for all $(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$, $x_1 < 0$, we have:

$$u(x_1, x_2) \geq u(-x_1, x_2), \quad u_1(x_1, x_2) < 0; \quad v(x_1, x_2) \geq v(-x_1, x_2), \quad v_1(x_1, x_2) < 0.$$

Type example for the boundary condition in Theorem 1 is when $u < 0$ and $v < 0$ in Ω with the Dirichlet boundary conditions $u = 0 = v$ on $\partial\Omega$. Theorem 1 will be proved by the use of the maximum principle and the method of moving planes in the similar spirit as in [2].

The above monotonicity result yields the following symmetry result.

Corollary 2. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1, we assume that Ω is symmetric in the x_1 direction, g and f are symmetric in x_1 and p_1 , i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v, p_1, p_2) &= g(u, v, -p_1, p_2), & \forall u, v, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall p_1 < 0; \\ f(u, v, p_1, p_2) &= f(u, v, -p_1, p_2), & \forall u, v, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall p_1 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Assume further that the boundary values of u, v are symmetric in the x_1 direction, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \partial\Omega, (x'_1, x_2) \in \Omega, \\ \text{then } u(x_1, x_2) &> u(x'_1, x_2), \quad v(x_1, x_2) > v(x'_1, x_2); \\ \text{if } (x_1, x_2), (x'_1, x_2) \in \partial\Omega, \\ \text{then } u(x_1, x_2) &= u(x'_1, x_2), \quad v(x_1, x_2) = v(x'_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then u, v are symmetric in the x_1 direction. That is

$$u(-x_1, x_2) = u(x_1, x_2), \quad v(-x_1, x_2) = v(x_1, x_2), \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega.$$

The plan of the paper is below. In section 2, we make a Lemma for the method of moving planes. We use the method of moving planes to prove Theorem 1 in section 3. Corollary 2 is proved in section 4.

2. MONGE-AMPERE SYSTEM IN BOUNDED DOMAINS IN $\mathbb{R}^2$

Denote by

$$a := -\inf\{x_1 \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega\} > 0.$$

In what follows, we shall use the method of moving planes. To proceed, we start by considering lines parallel to $x_1 = 0$, coming from $-a$. For each $-a < \lambda \leq 0$, we define

$$\Sigma(\lambda) := \{x \in \Omega \mid x_1 < \lambda\}, \quad T_\lambda := \{x \in \Omega \mid x_1 = \lambda\}.$$

For any point $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma(\lambda)$, let $x^\lambda = (2\lambda - x_1, x_2)$ be the reflected point with respect to the line T_λ . We define the reflected functions by

$$u_\lambda(x) := u(x^\lambda), \quad v_\lambda(x) := v(x^\lambda), \quad x \in \Sigma(\lambda),$$

and introduce the functions

$$U(x, \lambda) := u_\lambda(x) - u(x), \quad V(x, \lambda) := v_\lambda(x) - v(x), \quad x \in \Sigma(\lambda).$$

They also can be regarded as functions of three variables (x_1, x_2, λ) defined on

$$Q_\mu := \{(x_1, x_2, \lambda) \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma(\lambda), x_1 < \lambda < \mu\}.$$

By the definition of u_λ ,

$$\det(D^2 u_\lambda)(x) = \det(D^2 u)(x^\lambda).$$

By using the integral form of the mean value theorem, we obtain:

$$(5) \quad \det(D^2 u_\lambda)(x) - \det(D^2 u)(x) = a_{ij}(x) U_{ij}(x),$$

where

$$(6) \quad (a_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2}(\det(D^2 u_\lambda)(D^2 u_\lambda)^{-1} + \det(D^2 u)(D^2 u)^{-1}).$$

Noticing that the solution u, v are convex everywhere, we have

$$(7) \quad (a_{ij}(x)) > 0, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

We now compute the equations which $U(x, \lambda)$ and $V(x, \lambda)$ satisfy under an extra assumption: $\frac{\partial u_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$ or $\frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$. By using (3),

$$\det(D^2 u_\lambda)(x) = -g(u, v, \nabla u)(x^\lambda) = -g(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, -u_{\lambda,1}, u_{\lambda,2}) \geq -g(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \nabla u_\lambda).$$

Combining the above inequality with (5), we get

$$(8) \quad a_{ij} U_{ij}(x, \lambda) + g(u_\lambda(x), v_\lambda(x), \nabla u_\lambda(x)) - g(u(x), v(x), \nabla u(x)) \geq 0.$$

Similar computations derive that: when $\frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$,

$$(9) \quad b_{ij} V_{ij}(x, \lambda) + f(u_\lambda(x), v_\lambda(x), \nabla v_\lambda(x)) - f(u(x), v(x), \nabla v(x)) \geq 0,$$

where

$$(10) \quad (b_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2}(\det(D^2 v_\lambda)(D^2 v_\lambda)^{-1} + \det(D^2 v)(D^2 v)^{-1}).$$

Moreover, b_{ij} is also an uniformly elliptic coefficient matrix on $\bar{\Omega}$.

By using the Taylor's expansion, we can rewrite (8) and (9): at the point which satisfies $\frac{\partial u_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$,

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{ij} U_{ij} &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \theta_1(x, \lambda), u_{\lambda,2}) U_1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, u_1, \theta_2(x, \lambda)) U_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi_1(x, \lambda), v_\lambda, \nabla u) U + \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, \eta_1(x, \lambda), \nabla v) V \geq 0; \end{aligned}$$

at the point which satisfies $\frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} b_{ij} V_{ij} &+ \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \tau_1(x, \lambda), v_{\lambda,2}) V_1 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, v_1, \tau_2(x, \lambda)) V_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2(x, \lambda), v_\lambda, \nabla v) U + \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u, \eta_2(x, \lambda), \nabla v) V \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i(x, \lambda) &\in (\overline{u(x)}, \overline{u_\lambda(x)}), \quad \eta_i(x, \lambda) \in (\overline{v(x)}, \overline{v_\lambda(x)}), \\ \theta_i(x, \lambda) &\in (\overline{u_i(x)}, \overline{u_{\lambda,i}(x)}), \quad \tau_i(x, \lambda) \in (\overline{v_i(x)}, \overline{v_{\lambda,i}(x)}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the notation $(\overline{A}, \overline{B})$ to denote the open interval in the line from A to B . For a positive function ψ defined on Ω , we introduce functions:

$$\bar{U}(x, \lambda) := \frac{U(x, \lambda)}{\psi}, \quad \bar{V}(x, \lambda) := \frac{V(x, \lambda)}{\psi}.$$

Direct computation shows that: at the point which satisfies $\frac{\partial u_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (13) \quad a_{ij}\bar{U}_{ij} &+ (2a_{1j}\psi_j \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \theta_1(x, \lambda), u_{\lambda,2}))\bar{U}_1 \\
 &+ (2a_{2j}\psi_j \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, u_1, \theta_2(x, \lambda)))\bar{U}_2 \\
 &+ (a_{ij}\psi_{ij} \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \theta_1(x, \lambda), u_{\lambda,2}))\psi_1 \frac{1}{\psi} \\
 &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, u_1, \theta_2(x, \lambda))\psi_2 \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi_1(x, \lambda), v_\lambda, \nabla u))\bar{U} \\
 &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, \eta_1(x, \lambda), \nabla u)\bar{V} \geq 0;
 \end{aligned}$$

at the point which satisfies $\frac{\partial v_\lambda}{\partial x_1}(x) \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (14) \quad b_{ij}\bar{V}_{ij} &+ (2b_{1j}\psi_j \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \tau_1(x, \lambda), v_{\lambda,2}))\bar{V}_1 \\
 &+ (2b_{2j}\psi_j \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, v_1, \tau_2(x, \lambda)))\bar{V}_2 \\
 &+ (b_{ij}\psi_{ij} \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, \tau_1(x, \lambda), v_{\lambda,2}))\psi_1 \frac{1}{\psi} \\
 &+ \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, v_1, \tau_2(x, \lambda))\psi_2 \frac{1}{\psi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u, \eta_2(x, \lambda), \nabla v))\bar{V} \\
 &+ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2(x, \lambda), v_\lambda, \nabla v)\bar{U} \geq 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where ξ_i, η_i, θ_i and τ_i are the same as in (11) and (12).

From (6) and (10), we can consider (13) and (14) as two uniformly elliptic equations with bounded coefficients. The following result for two elliptic differential operators will be used in the proof of our main theorem.

Lemma 3. *Let $L_1 = A_{ij}(x)D_{ij} + B_i(x)D_i + C(x)$ and $L_2 = B_{ij}(x)D_{ij} + E_i(x)D_i + F(x)$ be two uniformly elliptic operators on a domain $\Sigma \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. That is*

$$A_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geq m^2|\xi|^2, \quad (m > 0), \quad B_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \geq m^2|\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, \forall x \in \Sigma,$$

$$|A_{ij}| + |B_i| + |C| + |B_{ij}| + |E_i| + |F| \leq C_0.$$

Then there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depends on m, C_0 only, such that if Σ lies in a narrow region in the x_1 direction $-a < x_1 < -a + \epsilon \leq -a + \epsilon_0$, then the function $\psi(x) = \psi(x_1) = e - e^{\frac{1}{2\epsilon}(x_1 + a)}$ which depends on x_1 satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (i) \quad &\forall (x, \lambda) \in \Sigma \times (-a, 0), \quad \psi > 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{L_1\psi}{\psi} < -1, \quad \frac{L_2\psi}{\psi} < -1; \\
 (ii) \quad &\forall (y_i, \lambda_i) \in \Sigma \times (-a, -a + \epsilon_0) \quad (i = 1, 2), \\
 &\frac{L_1\psi}{\psi}|_{(y_1, \lambda_1)} \frac{L_2\psi}{\psi}|_{(y_2, \lambda_2)} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, \eta_1, \nabla u)|_{(y_1, \lambda_1)} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2, v_\lambda, \nabla v)|_{(y_2, \lambda_2)} > 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where ξ_i and η_i are the same as in (11) and (12).

Proof. It is easy to see that $e - 1 \geq \psi(x) \geq e - e^{\frac{1}{2}} > 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} L_1\psi &= -A_{11}\frac{1}{4\epsilon^2}e^{\frac{1}{2\epsilon}(x_1+a)} - B_1\frac{1}{2\epsilon}e^{\frac{1}{2\epsilon}(x_1+a)} + C(e - e^{\frac{1}{2\epsilon}(x_1+a)}) \\ &\leq -(m^2\frac{1}{4\epsilon^2} - C_0\frac{1}{2\epsilon} - C_0) + C_0e. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small, we can make $\frac{L_1\psi}{\psi} < -1$ and $\frac{L_2\psi}{\psi} < -1$.

We now prove (ii). Actually, from above we can see that $\frac{L_i\psi}{\psi} \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ($i = 1, 2$). Moreover, $\frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, \eta_1, \nabla u)$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2, v_\lambda, \nabla v)$ are both bounded on Ω for all $-a < \lambda < 0$. Therefore, (ii) holds when ϵ_0 is sufficiently small. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We now use the moving planes method to prove Theorem 1. It consists of three steps:

Step 1. Prove $U(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ and $V(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ in Σ_λ for $0 < \lambda + a$ small.

Step 2. Prove $U(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ and $V(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ in Σ_λ for all λ in $(-a, 0)$.

Step 3. Prove $u_1(x) < 0$ and $v_1(x) < 0$, for all $(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega, x_1 < 0$.

Proof of Step 1. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be a constant which we will choose later. Assume for contraction that there exists a $\lambda_1 \in (-a, -a + \epsilon_0]$ and a point $y_1 \in \Sigma(\lambda_1)$ such that $U(y_1, \lambda_1) > 0$ i.e. $\bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) > 0$. We can choose (y_1, λ_1) such that

$$\bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) = \max_{(x, \lambda) \in Q_{-a+\epsilon_0}} \bar{U}(x, \lambda) > 0.$$

We claim that at (y_1, λ_1) , (13) holds. To see this, we should show $\frac{\partial u_{\lambda_1}}{\partial x_1}(y_1) \leq 0$. From the definition of $\bar{U}$ and from the boundary condition (2), we have

$$(15) \quad \bar{U}(x_1, \lambda) = 0 \text{ on } x_1 = \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{U} \leq 0 \text{ on } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

So we get

$$\frac{\partial \bar{U}}{\partial \lambda}(y_1, \lambda_1) \geq 0, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial \lambda}(y_1, \lambda_1) \geq 0.$$

Thus,

$$0 \leq \frac{\partial U}{\partial \lambda}(y_1, \lambda_1) = 2 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(y_1^{\lambda_1}) = -2 \frac{\partial u_{\lambda_1}}{\partial x_1}(y_1).$$

Therefore, (13) holds at point y_1 . Moreover, from (15) we can see y_1 in the interior of $\Sigma(\lambda_1)$. So there hold the followings:

$$(D_{ij}^2 \bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1)) \leq 0, \quad \nabla \bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) = 0.$$

Inequality (13) turns to be:

$$(16) \quad \frac{L_1\psi}{\psi}(y_1)\bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) + \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u(y_1), \eta_1(y_1, \lambda_1), \nabla u(y_1))\bar{V}(y_1, \lambda_1) \geq 0$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= a_{ij}(x, \lambda_1)D_{ij} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_1}, \theta_1(x, \lambda_1), u_{\lambda_1,2})D_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_1}, u_1, \theta_2(x, \lambda_1))D_2 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi_1(x, \lambda_1), v_{\lambda_1}, \nabla u). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3, we can choose ϵ_0 sufficiently small, such that $\frac{L_1\psi}{\psi} < -1$. Since $\bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) > 0$, it follows from (16) that

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u(y_1), \eta_1(y_1, \lambda_1), \nabla u(y_1))\bar{V}(y_1, \lambda_1) > 0.$$

Combining this with assumption (4), we have $\bar{V}(y_1, \lambda_1) > 0$. Therefore, we may take

$$\bar{V}(y_2, \lambda_2) = \max_{(x, \lambda) \in Q_{-a+\epsilon_0}} \bar{V}(x, \lambda) > 0.$$

Now using (14), we can repeat the above argument and show that $\bar{U}(y_2, \lambda_2) > 0$ and

$$(17) \quad \frac{L_2 \psi}{\psi}(y_2) \bar{V}(y_2, \lambda_2) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2(y_2, \lambda_2), v_{\lambda_2}(y_2), \nabla v(y_2)) \bar{U}(y_2, \lambda_2) \geq 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 &= b_{ij}(x, \lambda_2) D_{ij} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1}(u_{\lambda_2}, v_{\lambda_2}, \tau_1(x, \lambda_2), v_{\lambda_2, 2}) D_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_2}(u_{\lambda_2}, v_{\lambda_2}, v_1, \tau_2(x, \lambda_2) D_2 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u, \eta_2(x, \lambda_2), \nabla v). \end{aligned}$$

Let us put

$$\alpha(y_1, \lambda_1) = \frac{L_1 \psi}{\psi}(y_1) < 0, \quad \beta(y_1, \lambda_1) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u(y_1), \eta_1(y_1, \lambda_1), \nabla u(y_1)) > 0,$$

$$\gamma(y_2, \lambda_2) = \frac{L_2 \psi}{\psi}(y_2) \bar{V}(y_2, \lambda_2) < 0, \quad \delta(y_2, \lambda_2) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(\xi_2(y_2, \lambda_2), v_{\lambda_2}(y_2), \nabla v(y_2)) > 0.$$

From (16) and (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1) &\leq -\frac{\beta(y_1, \lambda_1)}{\alpha(y_1, \lambda_1)} \bar{V}(y_1, \lambda_1) \\ &\leq -\frac{\beta(y_1, \lambda_1)}{\alpha(y_1, \lambda_1)} \bar{V}(y_2, \lambda_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta(y_1, \lambda_1) \delta(y_2, \lambda_2)}{\alpha(y_1, \lambda_1) \gamma(y_2, \lambda_2)} \bar{U}(y_2, \lambda_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta(y_1, \lambda_1) \delta(y_2, \lambda_2)}{\alpha(y_1, \lambda_1) \gamma(y_2, \lambda_2)} \bar{U}(y_1, \lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$(18) \quad \alpha(y_1, \lambda_1) \gamma(y_2, \lambda_2) - \beta(y_1, \lambda_1) \delta(y_2, \lambda_2) \leq 0.$$

But from Lemma 3 (ii), we know that if we choose ϵ_0 sufficiently small, (18) does not hold.

(Step 1. is completed.)

Let us put

$$\bar{\mu} = \sup\{-a < \mu \leq 0 \mid U(x, \lambda) \leq 0, V(x, \lambda) \leq 0, \forall x \in \Sigma(\lambda), \forall \lambda \leq \mu\}.$$

We claim that $\bar{\mu} = 0$.

Proof of Step 2. Suppose the contrary, that $\bar{\mu} < 0$. The maximality of $\bar{\mu}$ tells us that there exist sequences $\{\lambda^k\}$ and $x^k \in \Sigma(\lambda^k)$ satisfy:

$$\bar{\mu} < \lambda^k < 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^k = \bar{\mu}; \quad U(x^k, \lambda^k) > 0 \text{ or } V(x^k, \lambda^k) > 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume

$$U(x^k, \lambda^k) = \max_{x \in \Sigma(\lambda^k)} U(x, \lambda^k) > 0; \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^k = \bar{x} \in \overline{\Sigma(\bar{\mu})}.$$

On one hand the boundary condition (2) tells us that $U(x, \lambda^k) \leq 0$, $x \in \partial \Sigma(\lambda^k) \setminus T_{\lambda^k}$. On the other hand when $x \in T_{\lambda^k}$, $U(x, \lambda^k) = 0$. Therefore, the point x^k must be an interior point of $\Sigma(\lambda^k)$, which implies:

$$(D^2 U(x^k, \lambda^k)) \leq 0, \quad \nabla U(x^k, \lambda^k) = 0, \quad U(x^k, \lambda^k) > 0.$$

Taking limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using the fact $U(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) \leq 0$, we obtain

$$(19) \quad (D^2 U(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu})) \leq 0, \quad \nabla U(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) = 0, \quad U(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) = 0.$$

We now derive the differential equation $U(x, \bar{\mu})$ satisfies. From the definition of $\bar{\mu}$, we can check that

$$u_1(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma(\bar{\mu}).$$

Using (3), we have

$$g(u(x), v(x), u_1(x), u_2(x)) \geq g(u(x), v(x), -u_1(x), u_2(x)) \quad \forall x \in \Sigma(\bar{\mu}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(x)U_{ij}(x, \bar{\mu}) &= \det(D^2 u_{\bar{\mu}})(x) - \det(D^2 u)(x) \\ &= \det(D^2 u)(x^{\bar{\mu}}) - \det(D^2 u)(x) \\ &= -g(u(x^{\bar{\mu}}), v(x^{\bar{\mu}}), \nabla u(x^{\bar{\mu}})) + g(u(x), v(x), \nabla u(x)) \\ &\geq -g(u(x^{\bar{\mu}}), v(x^{\bar{\mu}}), \nabla u(x^{\bar{\mu}})) + g(u(x), v(x), -u_1(x), u_2(x)) \\ &= -g(u_{\bar{\mu}}(x), v_{\bar{\mu}}(x), -u_{\bar{\mu},1}(x), u_{\bar{\mu},2}(x)) \\ &\quad + g(u(x), v(x), -u_1(x), u_2(x)). \end{aligned}$$

where $(a_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2}(\det(D^2 u_{\bar{\mu}})(D^2 u_{\bar{\mu}})^{-1} + \det(D^2 u)(D^2 u)^{-1})$. Using the Taylor's expansion, $U(x, \bar{\mu})$ satisfies: for all $x \in \Sigma(\bar{\mu})$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(x)U_{ij}(x, \bar{\mu}) &- \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_{\bar{\mu}}, v_{\bar{\mu}}, -\theta_1(x, \bar{\mu}), u_{\bar{\mu},2})U_1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_{\bar{\mu}}, v_{\bar{\mu}}, -u_1, \theta_2(x, \bar{\mu}))U_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi(x, \bar{\mu}), v_{\bar{\mu}}, -u_1, u_2)U + \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}(u, \eta_1(x, \bar{\mu}), -u_1, u_2)V(x, \bar{\mu}) \geq 0; \end{aligned}$$

Since $V(x, \bar{\mu}) \leq 0$, $\forall x \in \Sigma(\bar{\mu})$ and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial v} > 0$, we can rewrite the above inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(x)U_{ij}(x, \bar{\mu}) &- \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_{\bar{\mu}}, v_{\bar{\mu}}, -\theta_1(x, \bar{\mu}), u_{\bar{\mu},2})U_1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_{\bar{\mu}}, v_{\bar{\mu}}, -u_1, \theta_2(x, \bar{\mu}))U_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi(x, \bar{\mu}), v_{\bar{\mu}}, -u_1, u_2)U \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hopf's lemma implies $\bar{x} \in \partial\Sigma(\bar{\mu})$ and

$$(20) \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} < 0,$$

where ν is the outward normal on $\partial\Sigma(\bar{\mu})$. (20) is impossible since we already have (19).

Step 2. is completed.

Proof of Step 3. Form Step 2., we have obtained that $U(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ and $V(x, \lambda) \leq 0$ in Σ_λ for all $\lambda \in (-a, 0)$. Similar to the computation in Step 2., we can obtain: $\forall \lambda \in (-a, 0)$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(x)U_{ij}(x, \lambda) &- \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, -\theta_1(x, \lambda), u_{\lambda,2})U_1 + \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, -u_1, \theta_2(x, \lambda))U_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(\xi(x, \lambda), v_\lambda, -u_1, u_2)U \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi(x, \lambda) \in \overline{(u(x), u_\lambda(x))}$ and $\theta_i(x, \lambda) \in \overline{(u_i(x), u_{\lambda,i}(x))}$. Form using the fact that $U_\lambda \leq 0$ on $\partial\Sigma(\lambda)$ and $U_\lambda = 0$ on T_λ and by using the Hopf's lemma, we have $\frac{\partial U}{\partial x_1} > 0$ on T_λ , i.e.

$-2u_1(x_1, x_2) > 0$ for $x_1 = \lambda$. Therefore, $u_1(x_1, x_2) < 0$ for all $x_1 < 0$. Similarly, for V_λ :

$$\begin{aligned} b_{ij}(x)V_{ij}(x, \lambda) &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, -\tau_1(x, \lambda), v_{\lambda,2})V_1 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_2}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda, -v_1, \tau_2(x, \lambda))V_2 \\ &+ \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u, \eta, -v_1, v_2)V \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_i(x, \lambda) \in (\overline{v_i(x)}, \overline{v_{\lambda,i}(x)})$, $\eta(x, \lambda) \in (\overline{v(x)}, \overline{v_\lambda(x)})$. By using the above inequality, we can also get $v_1(x_1, x_2) < 0$ for all $x_1 < 0$. **(Step 3. is completed.)**

4. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

Corollary 2 is a simple consequence of Theorem 1. Applying Theorem 1 directly to the solution (u, v) , we obtain

$$(21) \quad u(x_1, x_2) \geq u(-x_1, x_2), \quad v(x_1, x_2) \geq v(-x_1, x_2), \quad x_1 < 0, \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega.$$

We consider functions:

$$\tilde{u}(x_1, x_2) = u(-x_1, x_2), \quad \tilde{v}(x_1, x_2) = v(-x_1, x_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega.$$

Since functions f and g are symmetric in p_1 and Ω is symmetric in x_1 , $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ is also a solution of (1). Thus we can apply Theorem 1 to $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ which tells us that

$$\tilde{u}(x_1, x_2) \leq \tilde{u}(-x_1, x_2), \quad \tilde{v}(x_1, x_2) \leq \tilde{v}(-x_1, x_2), \quad x_1 < 0, \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega,$$

or equivalently

$$(22) \quad u(-x_1, x_2) \leq u(x_1, x_2), \quad v(-x_1, x_2) \leq v(x_1, x_2), \quad x_1 < 0, \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega.$$

(21) and (22) together give us

$$u(-x_1, x_2) = u(x_1, x_2), \quad v(-x_1, x_2) = v(x_1, x_2), \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega.$$

Therefore u and v are both symmetric in x_1 and Corollary 2 is proved.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Berestycki and L. Nirenberg, *On the method of moving planes and the sliding method*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.) 22 (1991), no. 1, 1-37.
- [2] J. Busca, B. Sirakov, *Symmetry results for semilinear elliptic systems in the whole space*, J. Differential Equations, 163, 2000, 41-56.
- [3] W. Chen, C. Li, *Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations*, Duke Math. J., 63(1991) 615-622.
- [4] W. X. Chen, C. Li, *Maximum principles and method of moving planes*, Textbook in Chinese, 2009.
- [5] B. Gidas, W.M. Ni, L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*, Comm. Math. Phys., 68, (1979), p. 209-243.
- [6] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Math. Anal. Appl. Part A, Advances in Math. Suppl. Studies 7A, 1981, 369-402.
- [7] C. Li, *Monotonicity and symmetry of solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on bounded domains*, Comm. in Partial Differential Equations, 16(1991) 491-529.
- [8] Y. Li, W. M. Ni, *Radial symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Comm. Part. Diff. Eq., 18, 1993, 1043-1054.
- [9] Li Ma, Baiyu Liu, *Symmetry Results for classical solutions of Monge-Ampere system in the plane*, preprint, 2009.
- [10] N.S.Trudinger, J.Urbas, *The Dirichlet problem for the equation of prescribed Gauss curvature*, Bull. Aust.Math. Soc., 28(1983)217-231.

LM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100084, CHINA
E-mail address: lma@math.tsinghua.edu.cn

BL: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100084, CHINA
E-mail address: liuby05@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn